



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,138	03/10/2006	Dimitrios Evangelou Lizos	2005_1543A	4071
513 7590 10/22/2007 WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. 2033 K STREET N. W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021			EXAMINER DAVIS, BRIAN J	
			ART UNIT 1621	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/22/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/551,138

Applicant(s)

LIZOS ET AL.

Examiner

Brian J. Davis

Art Unit

1621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9-11, 19 and 26-28 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 September 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/29/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the specification does not contain a heading **Brief Description of the Drawings**. See MPEP 608.01(f). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

Claim 9-11 and 26-28 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The pharmaceutical formulation of claim 9 does not further limit the pharmaceutical agent (i.e. a *compound*) of claim 1. The methods of claims 10 and 11 do not further limit the pharmaceutical agent (i.e. a *compound*) of claim 1. The pharmaceutical formulation of claim 26 does not further limit the *compound* of claim 14. The methods of claims 27 and 28 do not further limit the *compound* of claim 14.

Claim 19 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The claim actually expands the definition of R^3 - R^{12} of the claim from which it depends (claim 18).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-11 and 29-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the compounds of formula (I), their pharmaceutical compositions and methods of using such compounds in the treatment of psychotic conditions, does not reasonably provide enablement for pharmaceutical agents (i.e. compounds) having serotonin 5-HT₇ receptor antagonist activity and muscarinic M₄ receptor agonist activity for use in treating psychotic conditions where the agent does not include a particular set of bisarylazepine compounds (see claim 1). The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

With regard to rejections under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, the following factors are considered (*In re Wands* 8 USPQ 2d 1400, 1404 (CAFC 1988)): a) Breadth of claims; b) Nature of invention; c) State of the prior art; d) Level of ordinary skill in the art; e) Level of predictability in the art; f) Amount of direction and guidance provided by the inventor; g) Working examples and; h) Level of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

a) The claims are extraordinarily broad: Applicant claims the universe of compounds which have serotonin 5-HT₇ receptor antagonist activity and muscarinic M₄ receptor agonist activity and which are not members of a set of excluded compounds.

b,c) The nature of the invention is determined in part by the state of the prior art.

The prior art, in general, teaches specific compounds which are useful in the treatment of psychotic conditions.

d) The level of skill in the art is considered to be relatively high.

e) The level of predictability in the art is considered to be relatively low.

The basis of all modern medicine and biology is, of course, chemistry. Yet even under the best of circumstances, and several hundred years after Lavoisier laid the foundations of its modern practice, chemistry remains an experimental science. Neither the medicinal/biological arts nor the chemical arts upon which they are based have advanced to the point where certainty has replaced the need for clinical and/or laboratory experimentation.

f,g) The amount of direction provided by the inventor is considered to be determined by the specification and the working examples. Applicant's working examples focus on a narrow set of structurally related compounds.

h) The amount of experimentation necessary to determine which compounds have the necessary receptor activity and which aren't members of a particular subset of bisarylazepines is excessive. The only way to determine the metes and bounds of the instant claims would be to synthesize the infinite set of compounds which are not the bisarylazepines of claim 1 and assay each of them for serotonin 5-HT₇ receptor

Art Unit: 1621

antagonist activity and muscarinic M₄ receptor agonist activity. Case law is clear on this point: the specification must teach how to make and use the invention, not teach how to figure out for oneself how to make and use the invention. *In re Gardner*, 166 USPQ 138 (CCPA 1970).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The exact meaning of the term "test procedure(s)" is unclear because it is undefined.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear how two -X-R¹³ groups together with the carbon atom in the ring to which they are both bonded can form a C=S group, or the cyclic group diagramed at the end of the claim.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The exact meaning of the term "substantially" is unclear because it is undefined.

Claims 15-23, 25-28 and 37-39 are also rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as claims which depend from indefinite claims are also indefinite. *Ex parte Cordova*, 10 USPQ 2d 1949, 1952 (PTO Bd. App. 1989).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by DE 2849558 (CAPLUS abstract). The reference teaches applicant's compound: RN=75211-11-9.

Claims 14, 18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Chemical Abstracts Service XP002287521, cite by applicant in the IDS. The reference teaches applicant's compound: RN=101398-76-9.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian J. Davis whose telephone number is 571-272-0638. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne (Bonnie) Eyler can be reached at 571-272-0871. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1621

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

 **BRIAN DAVIS**
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Brian J. Davis
October 17, 2007